



Susan O'Connell
Governance & Scrutiny Officer
Direct: 020 8132 1399

e-mail: susan.o'connell@enfield.gov.uk

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

**Wednesday, 2nd June, 2021 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XA**

The meeting will also be broadcast live. Please use link below to view/hear the meeting:

<https://bit.ly/2SnkhEq>

Membership:

Councillors : Susan Erbil (Chair), Margaret Greer (Deputy Chair), Lee David-Sanders, Birsen Demirel, Mahmut Aksanoglu, Elif Erbil, James Hockney and Derek Levy

Education Statutory Co-optees: 1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), vacancy (other faiths / denominations representative), Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative)

Enfield Youth Parliament Co-optees (2)
Support Officer – Claire Johnson (Head of Governance, Scrutiny & Registration Services)
Susan O'Connell (Governance & Scrutiny Officer)

AGENDA – PART 1

- 1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES**
- 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members of the Council are invited to identify any disclosable pecuniary,

other pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests relevant to the items on the agenda.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS (Pages 1 - 22)

To agree the minutes of the meetings 25 March 2021, 1 April 2021 and 8 April 2021.

4. CABINET PRIORITIES FOR 2021/22

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Caliskan will outline the Cabinet priorities for 2021/22.

5. PLANNING THE WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2021/22

The Committee to agree and prioritise items for the new work programme.

6. DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

To note that the next Overview & Scrutiny Committee business meeting is scheduled to take place on Tuesday 13 July 2021.

The next provisional Call-in Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting is scheduled to take place Thursday 17 June 2021.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 25.3.2021

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, 25 MARCH 2021****COUNCILLORS**

PRESENT Achilleas Georgiou, Edward Smith, Lee David-Sanders, Hass Yusuf, Birsen Demirel, Margaret Greer, Sinan Boztas and Kate Anolue

ABSENT Susan Erbil and Elif Erbil

STATUTORY CO-OPTES: *1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Mr Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative) - Italics Denotes absence*

OFFICERS: Sarah Cary, Executive Director Place, David Taylor, Head of Traffic & Transportation, Jonathan Goodson, Principal Engineer Traffic & Parking, Claire Johnson, Head of Governance, Scrutiny & Registration Services, Susan O'Connell, Governance & Scrutiny Officer

Also Attending: Councillor Guney Dogan (Cabinet Member for Environment & Sustainability)
Councillor Maria Alexandrou (Call-In Lead)

1**WELCOME & APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Cllr Susan Erbil (substitute Cllr Sinan Boztas) and Cllr Elif Erbil (Substitute Cllr Kate Anolue). In the absence of Councillor Susan Erbil, the Vice-Chair, Councillor Margaret Greer chaired the meeting.

The Panel were reminded of the current Purdah period during the meeting as follows:

"We are now in Purdah and during this heightened period of sensitivity it is important that we ensure that Council resources are not used for political purposes. With this in mind, councillors are reminded that when at Council events or public meetings, councillors must not use that platform for political purposes. If Officers in attendance at the meeting believe this is happening the Chair of the meeting will be informed.

2**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 25.3.2021

There were no declarations of interest.

**3
MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2021 were agreed.

**4
CALL IN: FARM ROAD YELLOW LINES AND BUS ROUTE 456**

The Chair introduced this item and explained the process to be followed in hearing the Call-in. Cllr Maria Alexandrou was welcomed as the Call-In lead and presented reasons for issuing the Call-in.

1. There will be a negative impact from the proposed yellow lines and a loss of parking spaces.
2. Loss of on street parking spaces will result in residents parking further away from their properties. This will impact on elderly residents, families with small children and residents with disabilities making simple tasks difficult
3. The report fails to take into account that it is highly unusual for petitioners and other people's objections to include an alternative course of action in the detail, for instance alternative routes were proposed such as Barrowwell Green, an extension of the Queens Avenue CPZ to houses with off street parking nearest Queens Avenue was dismissed as inappropriate. Yet it ignores the fact that the bus stops and yellow lines remove parking options for residents. Free parking for Farm Road residents at Fords Grove carpark and extend the current 45-minute free parking.
4. The level of opposition from residents, councillors and MP- has not been taken on board. Many households on Farm Road opposed by presenting a petition as did those on Firs Lane. There is also opposition from Station Road, and Hazel Green Close residents. There was an online petition on the 23 December 2020 against the bus route. Residents are incensed that the council delivered just a handful of letters at 10 pm on a Friday night a week before Christmas with a deadline of the 30 December which was later extended to 11 January. Only 9 letters were hand delivered to Bincote Road consulting on the bus route.
5. The report in paragraph 28 seems more concerned with reputational damage to the council with the Mayor than it does Farm Road residents' views.
6. The report does not reflect on the fact that the original consultation on the bus route that requires the stops and yellow lines was carried out two years ago
7. The trial period for a no waiting experiment in a residential road such as this does not need to be 18 months. It could be six months for 10:30-11:30 hour restriction Monday to Friday on a relatively short stretch of road. The Council claims that this one-hour parking restriction removes the presence of vehicles left long term on the road but ignores the inconvenience that applies to the residents living there. It may allow residents to dominant use

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 25.3.2021

- of this space outside of the control period but does not offer parking options during this one-hour specific period.
8. Bus stops: we understand the general point about distances between stops, but this obviously not fixed and as can be seen on any bus route, is subject to a flexible approach. In this case Farm Road does not generally experience high footfall, so the main customers in Farm Road would be expected to be residents of the road, but many have said(as reported) that they neither need or want bus stops in the road, but particular not at the proposed locations. Other objectives state it is not safe to place bus stops in Farm Road in the absence of crossing facilities. The footways are narrow and people waiting to board buses would obstruct the pathway for residents and hinder accessibility. The tone and some of the content of appendix C (discussion of objections and representations) is faintly dismissive and patronising of some of the representations. (see paras 5,10, 11, 18, 28 & 36).
 9. It is wrong to use Parking controls as a tool to dissuade car use as is openly admitted in para. 26 of the main report. Parking controls are intended to regulate the use of road space.
 10. The calculation of bus hours in Farm Road contained in the report is erroneous because the proposed bus service is not a 24 hour one. Issues of vibration have already been raised by residents and TfL directed the responsibility to the council. Buses are also mounting on the pavement. How can the council conclude that residents are not suffering? This council insists that residents universally oppose any bus stops near their houses and has chosen to ignore the overwhelming opposing views submitted. Communications from the Council have been deficit the council were aware of reservations on the suitability of the proposed route but did not engage properly with TfL to connect key locations together. The council is asked to reconsider and look again at the options put forward.

The Chair thanked Cllr Alexandrou and asked the Cabinet Member for Environment and Sustainability Cllr Guney Dogan to respond.

11. The 456 is the first new bus route in Enfield for 20 years the route links Crew Hill to North Middlesex hospital serving several areas lacking in a bus service on the way. The alignment of the new route was proposed and consulted on by TfL in 2019. In Winchmore Hill area a route via Farm road emerged as the preferred option as this filled an existing gap in service provision in a cost-effective way.
12. TFL considered a number of different route options avoiding Farm Road including those promoted by residents, but concluded that none offered the same benefits.
13. The new route started on the 13 March with temporary stops in place in Farm Road. The Call in relates specifically to the introduction of two fixed bus stops in Farm Road, some localised lengths of double yellow lines to create passing spaces to facilitate the passage of buses and other vehicles and a section of a single yellow line to be installed on an experimental basis intent to benefit residents by deterring commuter parking.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 25.3.2021

14. As part of the statutory traffic order making process residents in Farm Road were consulted on an initial set of proposals. Appendix A of the report shows that in light of comments received there were a number of changes to scheme proposed. There are two key changes. The original double yellow line covered the frontage of 27 homes in Farm Road including 7 or the 9 that the survey showed lack off street parking. Looking specifically at Farm road the revised double yellow lines now covers the frontage of 7 homes all of which have off street parking. The second change is an experimental single yellow line restriction is proposed adjacent to the rear boundary of Highfield Primary school, this will operate between 10:30-11:30am intended to deter commuter parking and create more parking opportunities for local residents.
15. It is acknowledged that the scheme still removes kerbside parking across 7 homes on Farm Road. However, this needs to be viewed in the context of the overall parking provision for the streets. It is estimated that the 34 homes benefit from a total of 50 off street spaces on the north side of Farm Road when accounting for frontage parking and garages. This is in addition to the 26 potential kerbside spaces including dropped kerbs. The 16 homes on the south side of Farm Road have higher level of parking capacity
16. The views of local residents are always important however the Council has to balance the competing need for limited road spaces against more strategic benefits. In Farm Road sought to limit the loss of parking and in the Cabinet Members view have struck a reasonable balance between the interests of existing Farm Road residents and the benefits to the wider community now and in the future arising from the introduction of a new bus service.

The Chair asked Members for any questions and comments, relevant to the call-in reasons:

17. Following a query, it was confirmed that frequency of the buses is 2 buses per hour in each direction and that the bus stops are on either side of the road with just pair in Farm Road.
18. There are 2 local schools in close proximity what degree has parking by parents been taken into account? The report does cover the concerns raised regarding the local schools and school run traffic under section 25 of the report.
19. Alleviating the pressure on parking that has been ruled out through using a CPZ or Ford's Grove- could some sort of system for residents without paying be introduced. The Cabinet Member confirmed that in terms of parking and the fairness of removing parking from Farm Road. Yellow lines only cover the front of 7 homes all of which have off street parking. The 50 homes in Farm road are relatively well served in terms of parking space either at their homes or in the same street. The proposed single yellow line is likely to have the effect of adding to the local parking spaces for residents.
20. Regarding the alternative routes that had been considered but did not offer the benefits of Farm Road, please expand on the benefits over the alternatives such as Ford's Grove and Barrowell Green? Members were

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 25.3.2021

advised that the decision on the route was made by TfL, the report explains why officers found TfL's rationale for the route to be persuasive and the best of the options available.

21. Was a risk assessment undertaken over the use of the narrow bridge in Farm Road? It was confirmed that the decision on the route was made by TfL. The route was tested using slightly larger bus than the one now in service to check its general suitability and was found on multiple occasions to pass this pinch point within the kerb lines. Surveys from October 2020 reveal a baseline level of 65 larger vehicles, buses or trucks using Farm Road per day. The layout has previously accommodated larger vehicles without attracting collisions or generating complaints. A number of route tests were carried out at different times of the day that demonstrated that the bus can make that turn safely, collision figures at the junction were also reviewed this did not indicate any concerns.
22. Councillor Alexandrou was asked are the other ward councillors concerned at proposals? Yes, she has been liaising with Councillor Barry on this, they have both received many emails and phone calls objecting to this.
23. An observation was made on part of the report (section 28) the council reputation and tone was unhelpful and was suggested that this should be looked at carefully on draft reports in future.
24. Was hail and stop considered for bus stops? TfL and the Council are committed to providing services that are fully accessible to all members of the community. Part of this strategy is using fixed bus stops. This allows fixed stops to be designed to allow the bus to pull in parallel to the kerb, can deploy a ramp if needed and ensure that someone using the service has a guarantee that they can get on and off the bus at accessible stops. Currently in the process of converting all hail and ride stops to fixed stops for this reason.
25. Was a risk assessment undertaken on the risk to children given the close proximity of schools? It was confirmed that a separate assessment specifically looking at the schools has not been undertaken, but the scheme has been assessed in the context of where it sits including knowing the schools are there.
26. The timeline for trial period is within 18 months and a minimum of 6 months. When would it become clear whether the trial is of little or no benefit? Could this be reviewed earlier? Officers confirmed that with experimental traffic orders that there must be a six-month period to allow comments and representations to be received before this could become permanent. If the view is that the scheme is unsuccessful, and residents have given their views earlier it could be removed earlier than the six months.
27. How are residents' views collated and at what point is there a response? It was confirmed that as part of the process the council writes to residents to advising that the trial is about to start and the scheme could be made permanent subject to the results of the consultation during the initial 6 month period. If at the start residents wrote in advising it is not helpful and is causing other problems, the process would be to take the comments to the Cabinet Member to decide whether to modify or remove the scheme.
28. Is it practical to change the route given the length of time taken to get new route? Officers confirmed the TfL undertook a consultation ending with a

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 25.3.2021

report in April 2020 to establish the route. It is not within the Council's control to change the bus route.

29. Following a query, it was confirmed that the bus will be single deck diesel models. It was tested with a longer electric bus to future proof for when this model comes into general service.

The Chair then called upon Councillor Maria Alexandrou to sum up the reasons for Call-in:

30. This new bus route and Farm Road yellow lines proposal seems to be facilitating the bus instead of supporting residents and fails to acknowledge that Farm road is not just used by commuters but by visitors using facilities in the high street. By removing parking with the added yellow lines this will have a negative impact not only on residents but also on the local economy. This is short sighted. Overall residents' objections as well as sensible suggestions have put aside to force this bus route and yellow lines through no matter of the impact on local residents. It is possible to achieve a more suitable bus route without Farm Road or Firs Lane, but alternative proposals were never warranted the appropriate attention. It is unclear how the yellow lines benefit those that reside in Farm Road. The whole process has been flawed which has led to the growing dissatisfaction.

Following comments on the issue of no risk assessments primarily for children, members attention was drawn to the reasons for the call in. These are the reasons to be considered at this meeting, anything outside of the call-in reasons is not part of the decision to be taken.

Overview & Scrutiny considered the reasons for the call-in and the responses provided.

Councillors Anolue, Boztas, Demirel, Greer and Yusuf voted in favour of the above decision. Councillor Achilleas Georgiou abstained. Councillors David-Sanders and Smith voted against. The original Portfolio decision was therefore agreed.

5

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The date of the next meeting was noted.

Members were asked to respond by tomorrow morning which of the dates suggested they are available for the new Call in.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, 1 APRIL 2021**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT (Chair) Susan Erbil, Achilleas Georgiou, Edward Smith, Lee David-Sanders, Birsen Demirel and Margaret Greer and Claire Stewart

ABSENT Elif Erbil

STATUTORY CO-OPTES: *1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Mr Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative) - Italics Denotes absence*

OFFICERS: Mark Bradbury, Director of Property & Economy, Bob Doyle, Head of Economic Development, Claire Johnson, Head of Governance, Scrutiny and Registration Services, Susan O'Connell, Governance and Scrutiny Officer

1

WELCOME & APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr Elif Erbil (Substitute Cllr Claire Stewart).

The Panel were reminded of the current Purdah period during the meeting as follows:

"We are now in Purdah and during this heightened period of sensitivity it is important that we ensure that Council resources are not used for political purposes. With this in mind, Councillors are reminded that when at Council events or public meetings, councillors must not use that platform for political purposes. If Officers in attendance at the meeting believe this is happening the Chair of the meeting will be informed.

1

WELCOME & APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr Elif Erbil (Substitute Cllr Claire Stewart).

The Panel were reminded of the current Purdah period during the meeting as follows:

"We are now in Purdah and during this heightened period of sensitivity it is important that we ensure that Council resources are not used for political purposes. With this in mind, Councillors are reminded that when at Council events or public meetings, councillors must not use that platform for political

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

purposes. If Officers in attendance at the meeting believe this is happening the Chair of the meeting will be informed.

2

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3

PARTNERSHIPS AND BUSINESSES

Mark Bradbury, Director of Property & Economy, and Bob Doyle, Head of Economic Development introduced the report.

NOTED:

1. Cabinet approved the Economic Development Strategy 'An Economy That Works for Everyone' in February.
2. The purpose of the new strategy is to:
 - Increase High Quality Employment Opportunities in the borough
 - Connect people with improved skills and training opportunities to be able to take advantage of the high-quality employment opportunities as they arise
 - Make better places in the borough in particular Town Centres
 - Craft a culture offer both for the people of Enfield and as part of London's wider culture offer.
3. The Pandemic has meant that the business support offer to the business communities has been enhanced. A business response team was established at the start of the pandemic. A range of grants was administered throughout the year, this is still ongoing.
4. To date over £100 million in grants and rates relief has been distributed. The latest grant is the Additional Restrictions Grant totalling £9.6 m, phase 1 of this is currently underway. This money must be allocated before the end of June.
5. To enhance the offer to the business community, an additional Head of Service has been seconded to the team to ensure that there is efficient delivery of the grants.
6. £106 m in terms of grants and rates relief received is detailed on page three of the agenda report.
7. There has been new investment and lots of interest in coming into the borough, examples of this being Metaswitch, a Microsoft company with global headquarters in Enfield Town. Troubadour Meridian Water Studios which has helped put Enfield on the map as a leading location for film and high-end TV production, the OMA Studios in the north of the borough and Global Streaming services.
8. In terms of investment from the Council, examples were highlighted which are detailed in the report such as Montague Industrial Estate, the Kickstart scheme and Angel Edmonton projects (Good Growth Fund and African Caribbean Business Centre which will both be delivered within the current year).

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

Comments, queries and questions raised:

9. The Strategy that went to Cabinet in February includes an employment breakdown in Enfield by industry. With regards to the wholesale retail trade covering the repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles, employee jobs were roughly twenty thousand. These industries have remained open during the pandemic, what support has this sector received? Officers confirmed that as the motor trade has larger premises than average this has meant that the rateable value was above the threshold for the early small business grants. Motor trade was a priority for the Discretionary Grant scheme. There were gaps in the earlier grant funding as they were not classified in the early criteria or their rateable value was too high. The Council have been looking at supply chains to ensure that these are supported. A lot of Enfield's economy is around supply chains that feed into businesses and the hospitality sector across London. Officers have been looking at the whole supply chain and using the more discretionary grants to support these.
10. What feedback has been received from local businesses for the draft Economic Development Strategy? Pre Covid there were a number of events for larger businesses to look at their priorities. The intention was then to engage with smaller business in a similar way. However, the pandemic has restricted this, but at the same time has provided opportunities to talk to businesses to help them access funding, after this help, the dialogue and support has continued and allowed feedback throughout. This feedback will be taken into account as the Strategy is finalised and then published.
11. The film and TV industry is growing in Enfield now working with potential supply chain businesses. There is a business who were previously involved in theatres, festivals and music events and the Council is now working with them to get them involved in producing sound stages and lighting rigs for film and TV industry, using funding from a partnership with Haringey and the GLA they will be able to take on 20 apprentices in a growing industry in Enfield.
12. Initially, members received complaints on delays in provision of grants after the Tier 4 restrictions in December, is this still an issue? It was confirmed that whilst there were software issues, all lockdown grants are now up to date.
13. Montague Estate, this has taken a long while and is still ongoing, would it have been possible to start work on the 20 acres already owned while the purchase of the remaining 9 acres goes through? Officers confirmed that things have moved rapidly in the last year, work has begun on land already owned by the council, there will be units available for occupation from October 2021. A report will go to Cabinet for approval for a Compulsory Purchase Order in due course. This will be a last resort, the Council is still negotiating with the landowners, there are some deals agreed. It is hoped that the CPO will bring the last few people to negotiate and will also include historic parts of the land where there is no title. There is an agreement in principle with the largest remaining landowner, currently finalising the Heads of Terms.
14. Metaswitch, is there any guarantee that they will still need the building as long as the 15-year lease? Would another business want to use this

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

space? Officers advised that there has been a regular dialogue throughout the project. Microsoft have assured the Council that this will be the European headquarters for the Azure brand (Cloud computing brand). The signs are positive, they intend to expand during the course of the lease. There is some nervousness in city centres in the office market. However, demand is increasing in suburbs and smaller towns for co working space in locations close to stations.

15. In discussions with Metaswitch and other office-based businesses has the mix between home working and office working been discussed? What the implications to retail in the town of home working? The discussions with Microsoft are very high level at present but have talked to other businesses about the future of offices. The general view is that there will be a move to working on average 3 days a week in the office, with much greater emphasis on collaboration when in the office. Metaswitch has built in the capacity to expand from 300 to 500. With more agile office working this may allow more people to work from the same office space and this may have a positive impact on town centres.
16. What is the relationship with government on how quick the grants move? An average grant received per business is often quite small was this enough to help businesses survive? Officers advised that during purdah it is not appropriate to comment on the government's policy on grants. In some instances, people fell through the net and the greater flexibility on discretionary grants has helps deal with this. The relationship is good with regular communication. There will be some business who have had relatively large amounts of money and do not survive, some that have had little money and survive and there will be some who have not had enough and will not survive.
17. Troubadour and OMA studios, what is the long-term deal and how long for, what are the economics and finances within the Council for keeping them in Enfield? The deal was done by the Meridian Water team. It was agreed that a short briefing would be provided to the members of OSC on this. OMA Studios, other than working with them and helping them through the planning process and helping to promote them, there are no dealings this a totally commercial deal.
18. Number 46 in the report details some new businesses coming into the borough. An observation was made that this is very positive.
19. Will Enfield residents get priority for the Skills Academy for the studios? The Strategy is moving Enfield to a higher wage economy and this will include making opportunities for Enfield's young people to get into these industries. Firstly, this will be sound stages and big studios, then the supply chain around this.
20. Green Economy, how close will the council be working with Capel Manor and other institutions on this issue? There will be a strong offer on the green economy, due to the development going on at Meridian Water and regeneration of other estates. This provides an opportunity for Enfield to become an exemplar authority introducing new ways of doing things, such as new transport, building materials and technologies. The Council is also having conversations with Central London universities about engaging in the green economy. Pre Covid there were discussions about the possible of an Institute for Technology within the borough

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

21. The Culture offer what does this mean? This is about encouraging residents to enjoy cultural pursuits, as well as making Enfield a place where cultural and creative industry can thrive.
22. How many businesses have been lost during pandemic? Are we working with job centres on this? During the pandemic the business start-up rate has accelerated. Whilst some businesses have failed and some people have lost jobs, this is also a time of new business opportunities. Business support will help people optimise these opportunities. The Pandemic has accelerated some trends where the business model was failing, some businesses have adapted and shown great innovation, transitioning into different markets.
23. An observation was made that due diligence work should be undertaken on the businesses that may have gone out of business during Covid to see where the council has engaged or could engage. Officers confirmed analysis will be undertaken once resources are available to look at opportunities to support businesses.

Officers were thanked for their presentation.

4

REFERRAL FROM CHILDREN YOUNG PEOPLE & EDUCATION SCRUTINY PANEL

Cllr Achilleas Georgiou, Chair of the Children Young People & Education Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

1. Members of the Youth Parliament and the Union had attended the Panel meeting on mental health and their attendance and input was very worthwhile.
2. On the first referral on mental health, this is an issue because of the lockdown and the pandemic itself over the last year.
3. The Youth Parliament and the unions came forward with views and this is their suggestion. This is a referral to Cabinet to put together an action plan around mental health. It is requested that the policy and that resources are put into this policy and that Cabinet does this in consultation with the various stakeholders including the Youth Parliament, unions and the Children, Young People & Education Scrutiny Panel.
4. The second recommendation is outlined in item 4 of the agenda report and is on Exclusions. This area of work started under a workstream. There are seven bullet points listed in terms of going forward. There are items for consideration for next year's Scrutiny Panel in their programme of work and some items to be brought to Cabinet's attention.
5. The overrepresentation of certain communities was highlighted. Exclusion figures have gone down but there are two groupings that are still higher. It was felt that action needs to be taken by the department, this is for the Scrutiny Panel to keep an eye on and this should be brought to Cabinet's attention.
6. Cabinet should also consider support to pupils going through exclusions and more support should be given to young people and also to governors.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

7. CAMHS the panel felt the referral process could be quicker and would ask Cabinet to look at this.
8. The six-week statutory period for Speech and Language service is not being met. This is for the department to work on and should be brought to Cabinets attention.
9. The final bullet point is around mental health.
10. Page 14 point 22 and 23 states that there are no risks associated with this report. It was felt that there should be risks here. Officers confirmed that when the report goes to Cabinet risks will be identified and included in this report. Risks are put in around the purpose of the report. The Equality Impact Assessment will also be looked at for the Cabinet report. As the report was just for scrutiny to consider the item there are no risks associated with that.

Comments, queries and questions:

11. Regarding the further work on overrepresentation, what is the timescale for this and what kind of data? Cllr Georgiou advised that data at national level is behind, a timing was not set as to when this should come back to Panel.
12. An observation was made that when mental health came to the Health & Adult Social Care Scrutiny Panel to look at the impact of Covid on Enfield and surrounding boroughs. The Head of Service advised that the number of referrals had gone down during Covid. What hard evidence is there that young people are suffering high levels of mental health issues? The threshold is quite high for CAMHS. Councillor Georgiou confirmed that the evidence taken on this was directly from the unions and the young people attending the meeting and spoke on behalf of other young people and other staff members in terms of how they have felt in the last year.
13. Exclusions, most schools have policies on exclusions, what schools are doing in this regard would be helpful? Councillor Georgiou drew attention to bullet point two- It was recognised that schools have their own policies on exclusions, and a number of schools are academies, but members felt further work on a uniform approach across the Borough would be beneficial, and an improved process for management of pupils between schools. The Panel had recognised that this will be difficult to achieve.
14. Exclusions- further work needed to support parents and students throughout the process- what is this? Governor training, is this around enhancing Governor training? Councillor Georgiou confirmed that it was felt that the parent pupil support and the governor training could be enhanced and that this support should be looked at.

Following the discussions two votes were taken.

OSC unanimously agreed to refer to Cabinet the following:

- The Council should produce an action orientated mental health charter and policy and provide the resources to make changes that will support young people and staff on matters such as information, uncertainty and staff wellbeing. In producing this the Council is asked to work with the various stakeholders including the unions and the Youth Parliament and with the involvement of the Children Young People and Education Scrutiny Panel.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

OSC unanimously agreed to refer the following to Children, Young People & Education scrutiny Panel to ensure that when setting the work programmes for 2021/22, the Children, Young People and Education Scrutiny Panel is asked to consider continuing with Exclusions as an item in order to fully explore and monitor the areas that need further work listed below, and at the appropriate time, OSC gives consideration to the matter being referred to Cabinet. It was agreed for referral to Cabinet for them to note and for them to act upon as necessary.

- That further work currently taking place to fully understand exclusions with regards to overrepresentation in certain communities was brought back to the Panel for a report on the findings and progress of this.
- It was recognised that schools have their own policies on exclusions, and a number of schools are academies, but members felt further work on a uniform approach across the Borough would be beneficial, and an improved process for management of pupils between schools.
- Governor training on exclusions was highlighted by members to consider smaller group sessions with case studies. An update on the training following changes to the service would be useful.
- Further work was needed to consider if the support available for parents and pupils throughout the process was sufficient.
- Further detail to come back to scrutiny on the CAMHS service, including the possibility/barriers to reducing the waiting time for referrals. Arrangements the service has for planning for a potential increase in referrals, and how the service is funded.
- The Panel recognised that difficulty with speech & language is a key trigger for exclusions. An update should address the challenges for the service not meeting its statutory six-week advice submission and what can be done to change this.
- The Panel would like to see an action plan for the growth in mental health issues affecting young people that are arising as a result of the pandemic both for the present and post-Covid-19. Members recognised that the events of the last months will have an enormous impact on young people's lives and may result in difficult to manage behaviour at school. The Panel should like to see all the other updated plans for managing behaviour in schools post-Covid-19.

The process for referral is detailed in the agenda report and the progress on this to be reported back to a future meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

5

VERBAL UPDATE FROM THE SCRUTINY CHAIRS

The Scrutiny Chairs provided the following brief updates.

The Chair of the Children, Young People & Education Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

- Two of the main items for the panel have already been covered under agenda item 4.
- The Panel had six meetings and covered eleven topics.
- The other topics included Covid and how the Council responded on a number of areas, Fostering, School Finances, Special Educational Needs & Disability (SEND); vulnerable children, and supporting schools and Headteachers.
- The Panel also provided feedback on the draft Children & Young People's Plan- Empowering Young Enfield and the draft Early Years Help for All Strategy
- The Poverty & Inequality Commission report recommendations came to the final Panel meeting. The Panel recognised that the commission only met a year ago and due to Covid it was hard to track everything originally planned. It was suggested that the Panel review this again next year and that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee could look at this next year as part of their new work programme.
- Members, Youth Parliament members and officers were thanked for the participation and contributions throughout the year.

The Chair of the Crime Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

- The Panel have met four times including the work planning meeting.
- The Panel covered at every meeting Safer & Stronger Communities Board performance management. The Safer & Stronger communities Board Partnership Plan is an annual item.
- The Panel also covered the following areas; prostitution (in detail in November and a follow up report in March), burglary, serious youth violence, reoffending, including youth reoffending, Modern Day Slavery and the role of the London Fire Brigade.
- One of the concerns that the Panel had was that lockdown has impacted on crime figures. The analysis on year on year crime figures will need to take this into account.
- Members and officers were thanked for support and contributions and the Cabinet Member for her attendance at several meetings.

The Chair of the Environment & Climate Change Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

- The Panel met on four occasions including the work planning meeting.
- In September, the Panel received a presentation on the Meridian Water Environment Strategy, this was due to come back to a meeting at the end of April, but this has now been cancelled due to purdah.
- In December, the Panel looked at Parks and Green Infrastructure Strategy and Waste Service Changes and Flytipping
- In February, the Panel looked at Climate Action Plan Implementation
- In March looked at Low Traffic Neighbourhood Scheme, the Leader of the Council attended for this item.
- Members and officers were thanked for support and contributions and the Leader of the Council for her attendance.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

The Chair of the Finance & Performance Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

- The Panel met on four occasions including the work planning meeting.
- The Panel looked at on average two items per meeting with seven items overall.
- The items covered were; the Budget 2020/21, impact of Covid19 on finance and performance, Housing Revenue Account, Debts – (including income and debt recovery; supporting residents in financial hardship), Grants – (including Council’s strategy and approach for grant applications), and Dedicated School Grant Approach.
- CIPFA Financial Management Code was added to the final meeting as this is a new code. It was suggested that an update on the progression of this is received as part of the 2021/22 work programme
- Monitoring reports went to every meeting.
- Members and officers were thanked for support and contributions and the Cabinet Member for her attendance at every meeting.

The Chair of the Health & Adult Social Care Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

- The Panel met on four occasions including the work planning meeting.
- The Panel covered a range of items the main one being Covid with several reports on these issues.
- Other issues considered were; Older People’s Assessment Unit at Chase Farm Hospital, Reconfiguration of the NHS (still in process), Adult Safeguarding Report, Reardon Court Extra Care Housing, and a report from Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health team
- One item on the follow up of the CQC Inspection on the North Middlesex Hospital Trust due to the pandemic was deferred.
- Members and officers were thanked for support and contributions and the Cabinet Member for her attendance at every meeting.

The Vice Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

- The Panel has met on three occasions including the work planning meeting with the final meeting scheduled for the 15 April.
- At Decembers meeting the Panel covered Building Safety and Capital Works, Housing White Paper.
- At February’s meeting the Panel covered Housing Advice Service/ Temporary Accommodation/Homelessness, Allocations Policy
- The final meeting is due to look at the role of Housing Associations.

The Chair of the Regeneration & Economic Development Scrutiny Panel highlighted the following:

- The Panel met on five occasions including the work planning meeting.
- There is a further workshop to look at local plans on the 14 April.
- The main areas were around estate regeneration around Meridian Water. The workstream on this was very helpful.
- Other areas included the Local Plan including Housing Needs and delivery; Skills training, improving Town Centres and the Cultural strategy

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

- Members and officers were thanked for support and contributions and the Leader for her attendance at every meeting she was invited to.

A question was raised on what the support will be for scrutiny next year and clarification on the detail as members are aware of a restructure of the Governance Team. Claire Johnson advised that in July 2020 the support to the Council's Committee structure including scrutiny was considered in light of the changes that were agreed at annual Council and the feedback from the Centre for Public Scrutiny (CFPS). The revised committee structure saw a number of the Council's formal committees streamlined and as a result of this the number of formal committees that the governance team supports has been reduced. The relevant departments will now lead on the work of the scrutiny panels providing the relevant information. Reports and briefings will continue to be provided by departments and the governance and scrutiny team members will continue to provide the constitutional advice and the administrative support to all the formal committees including scrutiny. This includes facilitating the coordination of the work programme, liaising with departments and chairs. The new structure reflects the revised workloads of the team.

There were new ways of working in terms of scrutiny which came from the CFPS report. There are now seven standing panels and no workstreams. The updates just provided demonstrates the amount of work the panels have achieved and the success of the new system. Over the next year this success can be built on.

Members sought assurance that will not be any change in the level of support received from officers in the governance team as they are aware of a consultation on a number of redundancies. A concern was raised on the independence of scrutiny and keeping the line between the executive and scrutiny.

It was acknowledged that these are difficult financial times and difficult decisions will need to be made going forward.

Officers confirmed that it is not appropriate to comment on the restructure. Members are reminded that the coordination, the liaison with the departments, the liaison with Chairs will continue from the governance team. The independence of scrutiny will continue to be championed.

Members requested that a briefing note is provided by the Monitoring Officer on details of what the plans are going forward.

**6
DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Members were reminded that there is a Call-in meeting on the 8 April and a provisional Call in meeting on the 27 April.

The dates for future business meetings will be set at annual Council.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 1.4.2021

Members were thanked for their participation throughout the year.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, 8 APRIL 2021**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Achilleas Georgiou, Edward Smith, Hass Yusuf, Birsen Demirel and Margaret Greer (Vice Chair)

ABSENT Susan Erbil, Lee David-Sanders and Elif Erbil

STATUTORY CO-OPTTEES: *1 vacancy (Church of England diocese representative), Mr Simon Goulden (other faiths/denominations representative), Mr Tony Murphy (Catholic diocese representative), Alicia Meniru & 1 vacancy (Parent Governor representative) - Italics Denotes absence*

OFFICERS: Sarah Cary (Executive Director Place), Mark Bradbury (Director of Property and Economy), Claire Johnson (Head of Governance, Scrutiny and Registration Services), Metin Halil (Governance and Scrutiny Officer), Andy Ellis (Governance and Scrutiny Officer).

Also Attending: Councillor Nesil Caliskan (Leader of the Council)
Councillor Joanne Laban (Call-In Lead)
Councillor Sinan Boztas (Substitute for Councillor Susan Erbil)
Councillor Mahym Bedekova (Substitute for Councillor Elif Erbil)
Cllr Jim Steven (Substitute for Councillor Lee David-Sanders)
25 attendees, viewing the meeting.

7

WELCOME & APOLOGIES

In the absence of Cllr Susan Erbil, Cllr Margaret Greer chaired the meeting. All members of the Committee introduced themselves. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Susan Erbil, Cllr Elif Erbil and Cllr Lee David-Sanders. Cllr Greer read a statement, reminding all Members of the requirements relating to the purdah period.

8

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.4.2021

9

CALL-IN: WHITEWEBBS PARK GOLF COURSE

The Chair outlined the purpose and format of the call-in process and detailed the options available to the Committee. The Chair also reiterated that only questions relating to the reasons for call-in would be permitted from Committee Members. The Chair requested Cllr Laban, as the Call-in Lead, to provide reasons for call-in.

- 1) It was noted that Whitewebbs Park Golf Course has many supporters and a petition with over 3,000 signatures, against potential closure, was previously presented to Full Council.
- 2) There was a lack of consultation with the many interested stakeholders, including residents and Friends of Parks Groups. It was stated that there was a moral and professional duty to consult.
- 3) The finances in the original report were queried, with particular reference to depreciation, central costs and costs of re-opening.
- 4) The premature closure of the golf course has resulted in a loss of income for the Council, especially considering the surge in golf witnessed at the lifting of the first lockdown in summer 2020.
- 5) The 'pay and play' system used at Whitewebbs Golf Club allows for affordable sport as opposed to the fees charged by private golf courses. With obesity related to cases of COVID, we need to encourage exercise.
- 6) The passion exhibited by residents and stakeholders should be acknowledged.

The Chair thanked Cllr Laban and asked the Leader of the Council, Cllr Caliskan and Officers to respond.

- 7) It was noted the Council finances are used responsibly and there is a need to address poverty and other areas deemed necessary.
- 8) The call-in relates to a technical report on the closure of the golf course. There has been consultation, with much discussion going back to March 2019. To say there has been no engagement is misleading.
- 9) The report identifies a commitment to the site but acknowledges a year on year loss.
- 10) It is necessary to review provision on site, in order that tax-payers money is not used to subsidise the cost of maintaining the golf course.
- 11) Enfield is in a fortunate position of being very well served by alternative golf courses, offering a range of fees and charges.
- 12) The specification for potential bidders allows for future provision of golf to be considered.
- 13) The closure of the golf course now, allows for a reduction in cost pressures associated with the site.

The Chair opened the discussion to Members of the Committee for any comments or questions.

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.4.2021

- 14) In response to a question about future access to the land it was confirmed that the land would remain open to the public, to be used by walkers, cyclists and horse-riders. In response to the petition to Full Council, the specification criteria has been enhanced and all bidders informed.
- 15) It was confirmed that further consultation would be undertaken, however, this has been delayed as a result of COVID restrictions. The views of the local MP would also be considered. Both the Council and bidders have been focused on other areas during the pandemic, however further steps will be announced following the elections to be held in May.
- 16) It was noted that although there was an increase of 55% in the number of rounds of golf played following lockdown, this figure did subside after the initial surge.
- 17) The response to call-in doesn't refute that there was a lack of consultation, therefore it is important to have clarity on the type of consultation to be undertaken going forward. There was wide ranging consultation on the marketing of the site, which was amended following residents comments.
- 18) Clarity was provided on the use of positive and negative figures within the financial elements of the original report. Depreciation covers equipment over time and is recognised in the accounts for the facility.
- 19) Further detail was requested on why a decision to close the golf course was made when there was an opportunity to earn income. It was noted that in effect, the golf course had been moth-balled. The maintenance costs of the course increase in proportion to usage during the summer months. In addition, there are considerable internal recharges, for example, ground staff.
- 20) The inclusion within the report of the number of golf courses around the world was deemed unnecessary. More detail was requested on the number of municipal golf courses in Enfield and neighbouring boroughs as the costs and availability of private clubs is prohibitive to many residents. It was confirmed that Trent Park and Lea Valley both offer 'pay and play' facilities.
- 21) It was agreed that the 'Lets Talk' approach to consultation could be used in future decisions to be made on the golf course.

The Chair asked Cllr Laban, as Call-in Lead, to summarise.

- 22) Cllr Laban summarised the issues in relation to consultation, finances, closure and usage and requested that the golf course be re-opened.

The Chair confirmed that having heard the reasons for call-in and the responses to call-in, the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would now be asked to vote. The options available to Members were:

- i) Confirm the original decision.
- ii) Refer the decision back to the Cabinet Member/Decision Maker for further consideration.
- iii) Refer to Full Council

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 8.4.2021

23) Councillors Greer, Georgiou, Yusuf, Demirel, Boztas and Bedekova voted to confirm the original decision. Councillors Smith and Steven voted to refer the matter to Full Council. The original decision was confirmed and can therefore be implemented.

10

DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The dates of future meetings will be confirmed following Annual Council on 19th May 2021.

The Chair thanked Members, officers and members of the public for attending the meeting and wished everyone well.